

**REMARKS**

Upon entry of the Amendment, Claims 1-5 are pending. Claims 1-3 have been amended to more particularly point the invention.

The present application is a continuation under 35 USC § 120 of Application No. 09/944,543, filed on August 31, 2001, now US Patent No. 6,774,908 ("the parent application"). The parent application included 9 sheets of drawings labeled Figs. 1-8. Upon review of the file, it has been recently determined that the drawings from the corresponding PCT were inadvertently filed with the instant case. The PCT case included 17 sheets of drawings, numbered Figs. 1- 16. The first 9 sheets of the PCT drawings (i.e. Figs 1-8) are identical Figs. 1-8 in the parent case. As such, the Applicant respectfully requests permission to cancel Figs. 9-16 so that the drawings in the instant case are consistent with the drawings in the parent case. The Applicant also recently noted that in a response, mailed on July 14, 2004, to a Request for a Substitute Specification, mailed on May 17, 2004, that the substitute specification for the PCT application was inadvertently provided which contained a description of the subject matter of Figs. 9-16. The Applicant respectfully requests that the earlier filed substitute specification be replaced with the enclosed substitute specification which is consistent with the parent application and has been amended slightly to include recent amendments (See paragraphs [0001] and [0002]) and to incorporate handwritten changes to the specification when the application was filed (See paragraph [0009]) which were the basis of the request for the substitute specification. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter has been added. A copy of the substitute specification is enclosed. The Examiner is respectfully requested to replace the current specification with the enclosed.

The rejections are addressed below. It is respectfully submitted that upon entry of the amendment and consideration of the remarks below, the Application is in condition for allowance.

### **CLAIM OBJECTIONS**

Claims 1 and 2<sup>1</sup>, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2 and 3 have been amended as suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the objection should be obviated.

### **CLAIMS REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 1-5 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for lacking an antecedent basis. In particular, claim 1 has been rejected for a lack of an antecedent basis for the phrase “separate from said video content.” It is respectfully submitted that claim 1 does include an antecedent basis for the term video content. Indeed, the preamble of the claim recites video content in a sequence of video frames. The phrase “separate from said video content” simply means that the linking files are separate from the video content. Thus, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Claim 2 has also been rejected for lack of an antecedent basis for the phrase “sample said video content.” Claim 2 is dependent upon claim 1. As mentioned above, claim 1 recites video content. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that sufficient antecedent basis exists for the phrase “sample said video content.” Thus, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

### **CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claim 1 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rangan, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,198,833. It is respectfully submitted that the Rangan, et al. patent actually teaches away from the invention recited in claim 1. In particular, claims 1-5 recite an image processing system which includes a video linking system which generates one or more linked video files which are separated from the video content. The Rangan, et al. patent teaches away from such a system. In particular, the Rangan, et al. patent teaches an automatic authoring

---

<sup>1</sup> The objection refers to claims 1 and 2. However, based on the content of the objection, it appears that the objection should be to claims 2 and 3. Thus, the objection is addressed as if claims 2 and 3 had been objected to.

system in which the video linking files are integrated with the video content. The Examiner's attention is respectfully directed to column 6, lines 48-51 ("This output video stream comprises the original stream plus the synchronous data stream that contains the tracking data and is illustrated (via directional arrow) as leaving module." In the Rangan, et al. patent, the video content is received by a video head-in system, identified with the reference numeral 15. The video content is then applied to an automatic authoring system identified with the reference numeral 11. The automatic authoring system 11 identifies pixel objects in each of the video frames that are selectable by a viewer. The frame number and x-y coordinates of these selectable pixel objects are then integrated into the video content and broadcast as a composite video stream.

One problem with the system as disclosed in the Rangan, et al. patent is that it requires modification of the original video content. The modification of the video content specifically relates to the addition of the video frame and x-y coordinate data to the video content signal. The system, in accordance with the present invention, eliminates the need to modify the video content. Rather than integrating the video linking files with the video content, the system in accordance with the present invention stores the video linking files, which identify the frames and x-y coordinates in each of those frames of selectable pixel objects, separately from the video content. More particularly, rather than integrating the tracking data with the video content, the system in accordance with the present invention simply stores the data in a separate file that, in turn, is synchronized by the end user application with the video content. With the system as recited in the claims at issue, absolutely no modification of the video content is required. For all of the above reasons, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 1.


Claims 2 and 3 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Rangan, et al. patent, further in view of the Vidovic, U.S. Patent No. 3,878,557. Claims 2 and 3 are dependent upon claim 1. The Rangan, et al. patent has already been discussed. The Vidovic

patent was cited for teaching a videotape recording apparatus which shows color frame pulses separated by 66 millihertz. The Vidovic patent otherwise does not disclose or suggest a video linking system which generates video linking files which are separate from the video content as recited in the claims at issue. For these reasons and the above reasons, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 2 and 3.

Claims 4 and 5 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Rangan, et al. patent in view of Toklu, U.S. Patent No. 6,549,643. Claims 4 and 5 are also dependent upon claim 1. The Rangan, et al. patent has been discussed above. The Toklu patent was cited for teaching video summarization methods, but does not otherwise disclose a video linking system which generates linked video files which identify the frame and location within the frame of selectable pixel objects within each frame. For these reasons and the above reasons, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 4 and 5.

Respectfully submitted,

KATTEN MUCHIN ROSENMAN LLP

By:   
John S. Paniaguas  
Registration No. 31,051  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

KATTEN MUCHIN ROSENMAN LLP  
525 W. Monroe Street  
Chicago, Illinois 60661-3693  
Telephone: (312) 902-5200  
Facsimile: (312) 902-1061